

REMARKS

The amendment to Claim 7 finds support in the specification at page 6 lines 7-12.

In response to Examiner's comment relative to the Information Disclosure Statement Applicant's note for the record that DE 198 48 516 (referred to in the specification at page 1 line23) is the indicated equivalent of U.S. Patent 6,503,585 and that said equivalent has been indicated to have been considered (PTO form 1449 returned with the Action of April 19, 2007).

Confirmation is requested that US2003/047837 to Roberts et al. has been considered in the course of examination. This document was submitted to the Office along with the corresponding International Search Report (see Information Disclosure Statement mailed September 10, 2006).

As presently amended the claimed process that entails injection molding a thermoplastic material onto a recited "section" requires the injection pressure to be sufficiently high to cause plastic deformation of at least some of the recited section.

Claims 7 and 9-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim (U.S. patent 5,560,672) in view of Dingler (U.S. patent 6,505,454) and Wycech (U.S. Patent 6,270,600).

Lim that disclosed an energy absorbing beam that entails a hollow chamber describes nothing relative to injection molding of thermoplastic material and further nothing relative to plastic deformation caused by such injection.

Dingler that disclosed a structural member and a process for its preparation includes nothing relative to plastic deformation caused by injection molding and therefore fails to augment Lim in any presently meaningful manner.

Wycech disclosed a method of reinforcing a structural member. The method that includes separate and distinct steps of forming a laminate preform and then shaping the laminate preform cannot reasonably be taken as complimenting Lim alone or Lim with Dingler in presently relevant manner.

Falling short of the prima facie case, the rejection alleging unpatentability over Lim in view of Dingler is clearly untenable. Reconsideration in view of the above and withdrawal of the rejection are solicited.

Claim 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim in view of Dingler and Wyech and further in view of Findlay (U.S. Patent 3,084,401)

Claim 8 which is directed to a narrower embodiment than that of Claim 7 further recites plastic deformation "during the molding".


The primary and secondary references have been discussed above and their shortcomings in the present context were noted.

Findlay disclosed a suspension system for receiving and supporting ceiling panels. Nothing in Findlay is seen to in anyway add to Lim, Dingler and Wycech each alone or in any combination in a manner describing the claimed invention.

Reconsideration of the patentability of Claim 8 in view of the above and withdrawal of the rejection are solicited.

Believing the above represent a complete response to the Office Action and that the application is in condition for allowance, Applicants request the earliest issuance of an indication to this effect.

Respectfully submitted,

By  _____
Aron Preis
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 29,426

Bayer MaterialScience LLC
100 Bayer Road
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15205-9741
(412) 777-3814
FACSIMILE PHONE NUMBER:
(412) 777-3902

LF/PREIS/ap326